

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/406,368	09/28/1999	FREDERICK M. DISCENZO	99RE067	1531	
7590 08/03/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
JOHN J HORN ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY INC PATENT DEPT 704P FLOOR 8 T-29 1201 SOUTH SECOND STREET			LEE, HWA S		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2877		
MILWAUKEE,	, WI 53204		DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/406,368	DISCENZO, FREDERICK M.			
· .	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Andrew H. Lee	2877			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply to a not places the application in			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 1 (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) 🗵 they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: claims 52-58.	•				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	·			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: 8-11.					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>39 and 40</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>33-38 and 41-51</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appl	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
<u> </u>					
10. Other:		FRIMARY EXAMINER SPE PRIMARY EXAMINER SPE 2877			

Continuation of 5. does not place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument that the difference between the "amount of light" and "intensity of light" is not persuasive in that one is inherently indicative of the other.